

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

v.

JOSHUA INGRAM

CRIMINAL ACTION

NO. 22-56-KSM-1

ORDER

AND NOW, this 6th day of September, 2024, upon consideration of Defendant's pro se § 2255 Motion to vacate, set aside, or correct his sentence (Doc. No. 60), and the response and reply thereto (Doc. Nos. 62, 63), **IT IS ORDERED** that the § 2255 Motion is **DENIED**. A Certificate of Appealability shall not issue.¹

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ Karen Spencer Marston

KAREN SPENCER MARSTON, J.

¹ Because jurists of reason would not debate the procedural or substantive dispositions of Petitioner's claims, no certificate of appealability should be granted. *See Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000) ("Where a district court has rejected the constitutional claims on the merits, the showing required to satisfy § 2253(c) is straightforward: The petitioner must demonstrate that reasonable jurists would find the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong. . . . When the district court denies a habeas petition on procedural grounds without reaching the prisoner's underlying constitutional claim, a COA should issue when the prisoner shows, at least, that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right and that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the district court was correct in its procedural ruling.").